

### **REMARKS**

The application contains claims 1, 3, and 9 – 15. By this amendment, claims 1, 9 and 10 have been amended and claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 11 – 15 have been added. Support for claims 11 – 15 can be found, for example, on page 10 of the present application. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the application.

### **Interview**

Applicant thanks Examiner Timblin for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative Wesley Jones during the telephone interview of February 12, 2007. A summary of the substance of the interview is set forth below.

During the interview, Applicant's representative asserted that the applied § 103 references, in particular *Kodavalla et al.*, did not render claims 1, 2, 9 and 10 obvious. No agreement as to the patentability of the claims was reached.

### **Objections to the Claims**

Claim 9 is amended to clarify the sequencing of limitations. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection of claim 9 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 10 is amended to correct a minor typographical error. Applicant therefore requests that the objection of claim 10 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **Prior Art Rejections**

#### **Claims 1, 3, 9 – 15 Define over Kodavalla et al. and Paul et al.**

Claims 1, 3, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kodavalla et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,717,919) in view of *Paul et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,051,080). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections because neither

*Kodavalla et al.* nor *Paul et al.*, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all elements of independent claims 1, 9 and 10.

Representative claim 1 recites:

A method for managing bufferpages and redundant copies of records in a local memory associated with a mobile device application, comprising:

(a) retrieving a first record from a remote database memory in response to a request from a first recordset;

(b) saving the first record on a first bufferpage of the local memory associated with the mobile device application, the first bufferpage being associated with the first recordset;

(c) repeating steps (a) and (b) for at least one further record;

(d) when a next record requested by the first recordset is larger than a freespace on the first bufferpage, saving the next record on a second bufferpage of the local memory associated with the mobile device application, the second bufferpage being associated with the first recordset;

(e) **determining if one of the first record, the at least one further record, and the next record was previously retrieved and saved in the local memory associated with the mobile device application by at least one of the first recordset and at least one second recordset as a prior record; and**

(f) **storing a pointer with the prior record, the pointer pointing to the one of the first record, the at least one further record, and the next record if one of the first record, the at least one further record, and the next record was previously retrieved and saved as the prior record, otherwise creating a b.o. kernel pointing to one of the first record, the at least one further record, and the next record.**

*Kodavalla et al.* does not teach or suggest “determining if one of the first record, the at least one further record, and the next record was previously retrieved and saved . . . as a prior record” as recited in claim 1. Further, *Kodavalla et al.* does not teach or suggest “storing a pointer with the

prior record . . . pointing to the one of the first record, the at least one further record, and the next record if one of the first record, the at least one further record, and the next record was previously retrieved and saved as the prior record” – and does not teach or suggest “creating a b.o. kernel pointing to one of the first record, the at least one further record, and the next record [if one of the first record, the at least one further record, and the next record was not previously retrieved and saved as the prior record]” as recited in claim 1. *Paul et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Kodavalla et al.* Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 be reconsidered and withdrawn as *Kodavalla et al.* and *Paul et al.* fail to teach or suggest all elements of claim 1.

Claims 3 and 11 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reasons applicable to claim 1, as well as due to the features recited therein.

Independent claims 9 and 10 recite limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 9 and 10 are allowable over *Kodavalla et al.* and *Paul et al.* for at least those reasons mentioned above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 12 depends from claim 9 and claims 13-15 depend from claim 10 and are allowable for at least the reasons applicable to claims from which they respectively depend, as well as due to the features recited therein.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the above amendments and favorable action in connection with this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or 1.17 to Kenyon & Kenyon Deposit Account No. 11-0600. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4419 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

All claims are allowable. Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 2/15/07

By: Wesley W. Jones  
Wesley W. Jones  
(Reg. No. 56,552)

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
1500 K Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005-1257  
Telephone: (202) 220-4419  
Facsimile: (202) 220-2201  
649133\_1.DOC